



Minutes of the 42nd Meeting of the Joanna Briggs Collaboration

The forty-second meeting of the Committee of Directors (CoD) was held between the five regional nodes face-to-face on the 10th -12th Nov 2011, in Adelaide, Australia.

1. INTRODUCTION AND FORMAL BUSINESS

1.1 Welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the face-to-face CoD, especially those attending their first meeting:

Prof Manuel Alves Rodrigues (Portugal), Dr Preben Peterson (Denmark), Dr Peter Roupas (Australia), Dr Suzi Robertson-Malt (Qatar), Prof Violeta Lopez (Australia), Dr Kiyoko Makimoto (Japan), Prof Debbie Kralick (Australia), Dr Heather Loveday (UK), Dr Joseph Molina (Singapore), Dr Cassia Soares (Brazil), Dr Hannan Khalil (Australia), Dr Yin Yin (Myanmar), Rajni Parasuram (Singapore), Dr Yash Kurusami (UK) and Dr Jennifer Chipps (South Africa)

It was noted that Collaborating Centre representatives were able to engage in debate and vote (using the voting cards provided) while Affiliate centre representatives could engage in debate only. Observers were not permitted to vote or engage in debate.

1.2 Present

Prof Alan Pearson AM (Chairperson), Dr Craig Lockwood, Dr Zoe Jordan, Dr Ed Aromataris, Florence Kalambokas, Dr Rebecca Cook-Johnson, Dr Cath Rogers-Clark, Dr Susanne Pearce, Prof Bridie Kent, Dr Silvia Florescu, Dr Susan Weeks, Dr Christina Godfrey, Dr Moranker Sudhakar, Dr Anthony Tuckett, Dr Deborah Parker, Dr Yeetey Enuameh, Dr Lisa Hopp, Dr Cassia Baldini Soares, Dr Nancy Donaldson, Dr Susan Salmond, Dr Cheryl Holly, Dr Peter Roupas, Dr Arja Holopainen, Dr Eui Geum Oh, Rajni Parasuram, Prof Patricia McInerney, Dr Yashodharan Kumarasamy, Prof Janita Chau, Dr Bart Geurden, Catalina del Rio Faes, April Merrill, Prof Margaret Harrison, Dr Susan Jones, Daniel Mitroussidis, Prof Robin Watts (Day 1 & 2), Constantine Tanywe, Judith Carrier, Dr Heather Loveday, Dr Joseph Molina, Sally Wilson, Trish McReynolds, Prof Anne Chang, Dr Yin Yin, Dr Jennifer Chipps, Prof Rhonda Griffiths, Dr Hanan Khalil, Prof Alison Kitson (for part of Day 3), Dr Rick Wiechula (for Day 1 & 2), Prof Debbie Kralik (Day 1 & 2), Prof Violeta Lopez, Prof Kiyoko Makimoto, Trish McReynolds, Dr Pei-Fan Mu, Dr Leah Mwai, Dr Preben Pedersen, Dr Wilawan Picheansathian, Dr Raluca Sfetcu, Dr Nick Allcock, Dr Fiona Bath-Hextall, Prof Deborah Tolson and Dr Janine Dizon and Dr Suzi Robertson-Malt (Day 1 & 2).



Secretariat

Dr Rebecca Cook-Johnson

1.3. Apologies

Dr Paola Chiari (Italy) and Dr Juliet Ndimwibo Babirye (Uganda)

1.4 Minutes of the July, 2011 meeting

It was noted that the minutes of the forty-first meeting of the CoD held via teleconference over the dates of the 24, 25 & 26th July 2011, were circulated and received.

1.5 Approval of Minutes

To confirm the minutes of the forty-first meeting of the Committee of Directors meeting held via teleconference over the dates of the 24, 25 & 26th July 2011.

It was agreed:

The minutes of the forty-first meeting of the Committee of Directors meeting were a true and accurate record of the meeting.

1.6 Matters Arising

It was noted:

Feedback was received from the NHS Accreditation process on JBI Best Practice Information Sheets (with particular reference to consumer engagement and economic statements). JBI are investigating strategies to address these issues but development and implementation of these will take time.

2 MATTERS FOR NOTING

2.1 JBI Program Reports – Associate Directors

2.1.1 Communication Science

It was noted:

- a) That the Communication Science Report was circulated and received
- b) The team had undergone a number of staff changes, which had presented some challenges but will again be at full capacity once the new Events Officer starts after the Convention



- c) PACEsetterS is now being produced by LWW and we will investigate options for emailing the Table of Contents to Centres to be able to promote it more widely
- d) That a number of new publications were released this year including the JBI Clinical Fellows Monograph, the Best Practice volume and the Reviewers Manual
- e) The Journal of Evidence Based Health Care continues with Prof Derek Frewin AO as Editor and Anthea Court as Receiving Editor
- f) That we are aware of the difficulties for Centres running short courses (particularly CSRT) and that we have invested significant time and resources this year in getting all programs up to date and ready for delivery. It is anticipated that this will now only occur on an annual basis and changes will be noted for Centres. A new online training and events software for overseas training will be implemented so participants can be tracked
- g) The events calendar for 2012 has been finalised and JBI will partner with RCNA who hold their conference in May in Queensland to run the National Australian Conference and with STTI as part of their Research Congress
- h) Good progress is being made in planning for the Colloquium in Thailand in November 2012
- i) We are interested in pursuing an international road show (running symposia in each region) jointly with Centres to promote JBI and EBHC

2.1.2 *Translation Science*

It was noted:

- a) That the Translation Science Report was circulated and received
- b) Dr Rie Konno and Dr Aye Aye Gyi have resigned and we have two people newly employed, Dr Judith Gomersall who specialises in health economics and Dr Kylie Porritt who specialises in qualitative synthesis
- c) It has been reported that there are problems with JBI COonNECT+ speed again and this is being investigated
- d) Translations progressing well

2.1.3 *Synthesis Science*

It was noted:

- a) That the Synthesis Science Report was circulated and received
- b) Introduction of a research assistant to assist the team and program
- c) Still working on the area of priority protocols as some have not been covered yet and would be useful for students and clinicians



- d) It was decided in the Committee of Management meeting (25th August, 2011 via teleconference) that secondary reviewers will be blinded and as a result of this the database will be investigated to ensure this can be achieved
- e) Uploads for the JBI Library should now take a maximum of 4 weeks
- f) Software Development: do NOT use SUMARI v4; delete and then download v5.
- g) The team are looking into what needs to be further developed such as TAP, Journal Club, and CAN-Implement@JBI, however would like feedback from the JBC
- h) Of particular note was how and when JBI Systematic Reviews are going to be eligible for an Impact Factor as it was previously timetabled to have occurred by now. Without this it is difficult to use as a level of output for research grants/funding bodies
- i) Plan is to have JBI Systematic Reviews indexed in SCOPUS (should occur within the first half of next year, with a retrospective back listing of 3 years). However, the process into ISIS is a longer process. JBI has hired a consultant to move this forward with some of the feedback so far indicating a need to restructure the JBI Library as well as become associated with an American publisher, such as JBI now has with LWW
- j) Also of note was how to submit an extension for submitting reviews when the title registry is 6 months for a protocol. It was stated that an email outlining that the review is not ready for submission is sufficient
- k) It was also noted that it is JBI's responsibility to notify reviewers of any changes to the software, and whilst this was acknowledged as true it was also pointed out that some Centres were engaging in training without informing JBI in Adelaide where the central database of reviewers is held. This issue is soon to be overcome by a new tracking system which has registered reviewers and an email notification system

2.1.4 School Manager Report

It was noted:

- a) Human Resources: a number of new positions created and changes to current contracts implemented
- b) Membership: computer system is being updated to ensure that numbers are tracked in real time
- c) It was noted that with the new agreement with Wolters Kluwer Health/Ovid that membership will increase and the ability to track/monitor will improve

2.2 Executive Directors Report

2.2.1 Committee of Management (CoM)

- a) The Faculty of Health Sciences at the University of Adelaide has had a careful look at the financial situation of JBI as there is currently a \$600,000 deficit with the hope of having this reduced



to \$500,000 by the end of 2011 and out of deficit by the end of 2012. It was acknowledged that the financial situation was affected by the global financial crisis with the strong Australian dollar being a disincentive for registrations and can account in large part for the 30% drop in membership revenue.

- b) There has also been a rise in general costs with pay rises needing to be funded and a large outlay of money due for software development and upgrades.
- c) The Faculty of Health Sciences have indicated however that they are confident that the deficit will be overcome. They also acknowledge that JBI's Strategic Plan is modest in its projections will, in all likelihood, proceed faster than is forecast.

2.2.2 Strategic Plan

- a) The JBI Strategic Plan was tabled at the last CoM with the outcome being a requirement to make significant changes and as such a revised Plan will be released within the next few months

2.2.3 Software Development

- a) Due to the development and/or upgrade of a number of JBI software and the move to Lippincott, Williams and Wilkins (LWW) network a system of subscription fees will now be implemented. This however will mainly affect new users
- b) JBI TAP will cease to be free of charge with the subscription fee of US\$15 pp pa raising a small amount of revenue to facilitate further software development
- c) JBI SUMARI will also be subscription based with a US\$30 pa fee allowing two subscribers. However, if currently a member this service will remain free
- d) JBI SUMARI will continue to be free access for all existing users however new users will have to subscribe to register. Students registered as Centre Affiliates will be eligible for free access but only for the duration of their enrolment/candidature

3. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

3.1 JBC and Methodological Development

The JBC Committee of Directors were invited to consider and ratify the following recommendations:



Item 1: The terms of reference for the Scientific Committee be varied to provide a right of audience and debate (but not voting rights) to the Director (or their nominee) of every Centre

It was agreed that:

- a) Disputes unable to be resolved by the primary reviewer and review author will be dealt with by the Scientific Committee with the Centres having a right of reply
- b) A full Collaborating Centre Director be voted onto the Scientific Committee for full transparency

Carried: unanimously

Item 2: Adherence to a set of standardised approaches set down by the JBI as ratified by the Scientific Committee be reaffirmed.

Carried: unanimously

Item 3: That any dispute between JBI Reviewers and the SSU be referred for resolution, as a matter of course, to the Scientific Committee.

Carried: unanimously

Item 4: That Centres have a right of audience at the Scientific Committee meetings on the basis of submission of a discussion paper two weeks prior to a Scientific Committee meeting.

It was noted:

- a) For clarification this meant that background issues will not be discussed unless there was a substantive paper tabled for discussion

Carried: unanimously

Item 5: That the policy requiring that primary and secondary reviewers are certified as JBI Reviewers following attendance at the standardised Comprehensive Systematic Review Training Program (CSRTP) be reaffirmed.

It was noted:

- a) Cochrane reviewers are qualified if an individual can confirm they have completed a Cochrane training course
- b) A reviewer will be assessed on an individual basis if their training is older than 3 years and have not completed a systematic review in 2 years

Carried: unanimously

Item 6: That the policy that the Train the Trainer (TtT) program must be delivered by experienced and senior staff of JBI be reaffirmed.

It was noted:

- a) That with the global growth of JBI it is important to build capacity on all continents and if training is not available it will limit JBIs growth



- b) That there is a need to support, mentor and teach a much larger group who are able to deliver TtT
- c) That training in other languages can also be done if TtT is able to be given by others
- d) That communication and consistency might be managed better if there is a TtT in each region
- e) That the JBI, as an operating unit of the University of Adelaide, hold the intellectual property (IP) of the CSRT program and its resources and that licensing of this course needs to be managed very carefully for this reason
- f) That monitoring and delivery of the TtT course and accreditation of trainers needs to be rigorous

Against: Majority

It was agreed:

That JBI would take this feedback under advisement and seek guidance from Adelaide Research and Innovation (ARI – who manage the University of Adelaide's commercial research and consultancy partnerships).

- Item 7: That only a small number (up to a maximum of six) of experienced reviewers who are core to the operations from Centres are entitled to free-of-charge certification.

It was noted:

- a) There was general agreement with this however need to address the idea of increasing the number on an individual Centres basis depending on the services an Institute offers

Carried: unanimously

- Item 8: That the policy that trainers are required to refresh their knowledge of the constantly changing software on a regular basis (every two years) be reaffirmed.

It was noted:

- a) That a refresher course be completed using online resources at a minimum of every two years rather than having to complete a formal face-to-face course
- b) If a trainer is conducting reviews and also conducting CSR training then they are staying current. JBI needs to come up with a strategy of how to measure this

It was agreed:

That the Institute would take comments under advisement and come back to the Committee at the next meeting.

- Item 9: That the Editor of the JBI Library of Systematic Reviews will take the advice of the Scientific Committee on issues related to the science of publications submitted to the Library for publication.

Carried: unanimously



3.2 Wolters Kluwer Health presentation

Presented by Mark Barragrey, Director of Project Management, WKH)

3.3 JBI/JBC Branding

It was noted:

- a) That due to integration with the UoA and the pending commercial partnership the Institute has had to re-assess its corporate branding. In line with this the branding of the Institute and associated identities (JBC, JBF etc) is now consistent, utilising the JBI Crest logo and the JBI Pebble logo will only be utilised in association with the commercial partner
- b) These logos are now the only ones approved for use and have been included in discs supplied at the CoD meeting
- c) JBI will continue to supply Centres with a banner for promotion that includes the JBC crest but will no longer customise banners
- d) All logos and relevant graphics/templates will be made available to Centres via the JBC Intranet

3.4 Nomination of the 2014 JBI Colloquium Host

Presented by the Singapore Centre Director Dr Emily Ang and Sitti Mordiffi

It was noted:

- a) That this was a strong proposal, however concerns were raised over the capacity of the venue to deal with more than 300 delegates. Dr Ang and colleagues expressed their confidence to be able to deal with this should the problem arise.

The CoD was invited to endorse the plan to have the 2014 Colloquium in Singapore.

Carried: unanimously

3.5 Value of Linking with JBI

It was noted:

- a) That some of the terms still needed to be clarified (such as entities, Centres, ESGs and EUGs)
- b) That there is a need to explain how JBI is different from Cochrane (especially in the UK)
- c) That Directors would like paper to show why an organisation should link to JBI (such as highlighting education programs)



which expedite audit and learning and also new products such as Journal Club and its advantages)

- d) That there is a need to highlight how linking with JBI is mutually beneficial and this needs to be summarised in one page
- e) That testimonials of the benefits from other Centre directors and if possible Deans/VCs of organisations where a JBC Centre is located would be useful

Action:

Centre Directors should provide testimonials for inclusion in the revised document

The Communication team will produce a revised Word document to circulate

3.6 Criteria for establishing core JBC staff

Three recommendations were tabled for consideration and discussion.

It was noted:

- a) Core staff should be trained prior to being recognised as such or a timeline of training be put forward
- b) That the brief application form should be modified to account for some of the intricacies of staff/student involvement in Centre activities.

Carried: unanimously

3.7 Centre Performance

There were a number of entries questioned by Directors and therefore this attachment will be re-assessed and re-issued.

3.8 JBC Handbook

2011 Updates to the JBC Handbook were discussed in detail

It was noted:

- a) In future the changes to the handbook would be noted prior to the meeting
- b) Organisational information (that currently appears at the front of the handbook) would be moved to the back as an appendix
- c) Information related to the Scientific Committee (on page 11) would be modified to reflect the decisions made at this meeting



- d) Information related to the Aged Care Fellowships funded by the Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing (on page 13) would be removed
- e) Paediatrics would be added to the list of ERG's and CRG's at page 57 and 59 respectively

4. TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

4.1 Node development

It was noted:

- a) That Node services are not well defined and the measure of output for nodes also not well developed
- b) That Nodes are not viewed as being particularly useful and just seen as something that takes time away from normal work
- c) That it is not currently possible to share staff between Centres to establish a Node that fits in with combined Centres focus
- d) Nodes that are most successful either have paid individuals whose job it is to manage the Node or a strong leader who drives this
- e) That the Burns node has been particularly successful and provides a good model for others to follow and could be distributed to others to follow

4.2 Linguistic Translation

It was noted:

- a) That there continues to be challenges around translation of software and tools (specifically with regard to which languages are accepted)
- b) That there is a desire to see other languages included but barriers include the fact that some European countries expect English to be used so would not see translating the site as useful (e.g. Switzerland)
- c) Countries like Japan where JBI have had translational success are the biggest users of online services in the world
- d) There is also an issue with the JBI website and tools being updated and the subsequent need for the translated sites to be updated as a matter of urgency
- e) The EU has been flagged as a possibility to help fund a translation initiative, however this needs to go through a site in the EU (JBI Adelaide cannot drive this). The Nottingham Centre has suggested they may be able to look into this

It was agreed: That the JBC would take note of funding and other opportunities for growing translational capacity for JBI COⁿNECT+.



4.3 Global Learning Centre

It was noted:

- a) All online learning will go to the JBI Global Learning Centre and JBI are also trying to develop a link with LWW courses
- b) That the development of the online CSRT course has been completed by the Texas Centre and is currently under review by JBI
- c) That there is still the issue of continuing education points being attributed to these courses in regions such as the USA, however, this cannot be achieved by JBI in Australia and it would have to go through the USA Centres. TCU is interested however course evaluation and analysis would be difficult
- d) In the UK a course can be given credit but would need to go through each College separately
- e) That there are concerns regarding CSR being online and the potential impact this might have on the earning potential of Centres
- f) That if the cost of online courses is similar to courses delivered in person that most people would wish to continue learning face-to-face

Actions:

- a) JBI to assess the viability of notifying Centres when an individual in their region does an online course so they can contact and offer help/resources

4.4 Systematic Reviews

Current systematic reviews are being reformatted and indexed to bring them more in line with a restructure and facilitating JBIs ability to apply for an Impact Factor. The new version of the library will have SR, BPIS, protocols and technical reports in a volumised library, which will enable it to be searchable by keywords or type.

It was noted:

- a) Authors of SRs need to be very careful with what they include in papers they generate from SRs as new computer systems now flag if a paper used within a SR has had over a certain % of content used and can be rejected as not an original work
- b) Authors need to pay particular attention to titles and keywords for example do not use keywords if in the title
- c) Centres need to remember that the SSU are available for support from developing a protocol to producing a SR



- d) Reviewers need to liaise and obtain methodological advice from the SSU as issues arise when a SR is submitted especially if the SR no longer resembles the original submitted protocol
- e) That it would be useful for Centre Directors to be copied into communication regarding reviews being conducted by staff from their Centre
- f) That it is important to ensure that the SSU is not used as a quasi-supervisor for Centre students

Systematic reviews older than 3 years need to be updated and it is the responsibility of the Centre where the review was produced to do this (3 updates count as one review towards the centres MOU requirements). If the individual who produced the review does not wish to do the update the Centre where it was originally produced then has the first rights to this, however if the Centre also does not wish to do the update other Centres are able to apply to do the update

Actions:

- a) Centres to be informed when a review needs an update 6 months prior to expiry
- b) If a BPIS produced from a SR becomes obsolete due to new information/technology, it cannot be updated until the associated review is updated

4.5 SUMARI (version 5.0) presentation

Presented by Dr Edoardo Aromataris

5. THE JOANNA BRIGGS FOUNDATION

5.1 A brief history and overview of the JBF

This was presented by Prof Alan Pearson

5.2 JBF Activity report for 2011

Prof Alison Kitson

It was noted:

- a) That although flyers were given at the luncheon there was still considerable work to be done around promoting the JBI and JBF before people would donate
- b) Donor cards, which works in Australia as they accrue a tax deduction, were considered, however this is not feasible in the USA and UK (although they could potentially donate through sponsorship of a table at an event)



- c) In Denmark it is not possible to ask for money without permission from police, however they could donate through the addition of a fee to an event such as a Convention
- d) The JBF committee are looking at running high-end lunches in Sydney/Melbourne and the possibility of holding events around JBI events being held in other countries
- e) It might be possible for Directors who are authors of books to donate their royalty fees to the Foundation

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

6.1 Clarification of Meta-Aggregation Methodology

Dr Lisa Hopp, Director of the Indiana Center for Evidence-Based Nursing Practice, presented a discussion paper on behalf of Dr Leslie Rittenmeyer, Deputy Director of Synthesis, Indiana Center for Evidence-Based Nursing Practice.

It was noted:

- a) There are inconsistencies in reviews of what is credible and equivocal so is it possible to develop tools that allow more data to be added into NOTARI so the data becomes better defined?
- b) Is it possible to create a tool for Qualitative research only?
- c) With qualitative reviews there is a high degree of variability in the development of synthesised findings by reviewers
- d) There are issues raised here which do require attention as interpretation of qualitative data can be driven by how well the reviewer has been taught
- e) JBI have identified there is a need to do more substantive work on qualitative synthesis and the best way to do this is to find funds to establish a development group and bring together this group with a plan to redevelop software tools
- f) The Colloquium in 2012 could have a substantive session/workshop of the issues in the qualitative SR process including appraisal tools with the agenda items being pre circulated before the Colloquium

It was recommended:

That the JBC submit this item to the Scientific Committee for consideration and discussion.

In addition the JBC would like to thank Dr Lesley Rittenmeyer and also convey that it was well received.

6.2 Financial prudence

(tabled by Prof Bridie Kent)

It was noted:



- a) That many members of the CoD did not attend the formal and informal dinners (although they had responded to say they would) and that JBI incurred the cost
- b) That the intent of these dinners was to provide some financial relief to Centres and also to provide an opportunity for staff of the Institute and Directors to network and get to know each other better
- c) That while Directors found these events useful the program was very busy and could be tiring, an issue of Conference/CoD burn-out

It was agreed:

That JBI would consider revising the CoD program for future meetings.

6.3 Incentives for collaboration between centres on reviews

(tabled by A/Prof Susan Weeks)

It was noted:

- a) That there needs to be a clarification of incentives for collaborating on SR between Centres.
- b) That currently, if two Centres produce a review, half credits are given to acknowledge having produced a review
- c) That Centres remain hesitant as collaborating becomes more complex and team effort appear too challenging
- d) That Centres would like clarification regarding ownership of the review if the collaboration falls down and/or if the review needs to be upgraded

It was agreed:

That JBI would take these considerations under advisement and provide feedback at the next meeting.

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the CoD will occur via teleconference by region. Dates to be advised.